DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 364 UD 012 046

TITLE	An Evaluation of Teaching English as a Second Language in the Public Schools.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Public Schools, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	25 Sep 69
NOTE	68p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; Curriculum Evaluation; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *English (Second Language); English Instruction; Instructional Materials; *Program Evaluation; *Public Schools; Reading Material Selection; Spanish Speaking; Teaching Methods; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *New York City

ABSTRACT

During the academic year 1968-69, the ESEA Title I sponsored "Teaching English as a Second Language in the Public Schools" (in the New York City Board of Education) was in its second of a projected three year program. The programs under this grant which are being considered in this evaluation are the Pilot Projects Using Linguistically-Oriented Materials and the Reception Class Project (Non-English). The focus for the former is on a linguistic approach to the teaching of beginning reading and, for the latter, on teaching English to non-English speaking pupils (especially new arrivals from Puterto Rico) on helping them adjust to school life, and on teaching the basic skills. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine the effectivness of the teaching and learning situation as it involved the cited programs and to determine the effectiveness of the materials themselves with reference to the particular group of students with whom they were being used, namely students of English as a Second Language. Since such standardized tests as the Metropolitan Reading Tests are of doubtful validity when used with non-native speakers of English because of the linguistic problems involved, it was decided that no normalized instruments would be used during the second year of the evaluation. The basic data was provided by interviewing program personnel, questionnaires for the teachers, and an intensive analysis of the text materials used in the programs. (Author/JM)

ED 058364

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN EVALUATION OF TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1967-68 school year.

Project Director:

Professor Harvey Nadler

Center for Field Research and School Services
School of Education
New York University

UD 012046

September 1969

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

School of Education
Center for Field Research and School Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses

51 PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
AREA 212 598-2898

September 25, 1969

Dr. Wayne Wrightstone
Assistant Superintendent
Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Dr. Wrightstone:

In fulfillment of the agreement dated January 29, 1969 between the New York City Public Schools and the Center for Field Research and School Services, I am pleased to submit six hundred copies of a report of an evaluation of the program Teaching English as a Second Language.

The Bureau of Research and the professional staff of the New York City Public Schools were most cooperative in providing data and facilitating the study in general. Although the objective of the team was to evaluate a project funded under Title I, this report goes beyond this goal. Explicit in this report are recommendations for modifications and improvement of the program. Consequently this report will serve its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with education in New York City -- the Board of Education, professional staff, students, parents, lay leaders, and other citizens. To this end the study team is prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of its report. In addition, the study team looks forward to our continued affiliation with the New York City Public Schools.

You may be sure that New York University and its School of Education will maintain a continuing interest in the schools of New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

Arnold Spinner
Director

AS:fjs

cc: Dean Daniel E. Griffiths

PREFACE

Unlike most evaluations, this one does not end with a conclusion and an answer. It would be wiser to read this report in toto than to look, in vain, for the one or two paragraphs that give all of the answers. The team of evaluators from New York University believes that the process of education is not tested merely by being examined or by the recording of statistical data. Education is a process that requires time and experimentation, and if something works or does not work, the most valuable function that can be performed is the one that attempts to find ways to make it work, or to make it work even more successfully. The evaluators do not want anyone to be able to look at the conclusions and say, "That's it. Throw out both projects." or "That's it. Throw out the other project and all of the other materials currently being used in all other classes." When the third year of these programs is completed, the primary question that should be answered is "What can be done to make them better?"

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Our sincere thanks are hereby extended to the personnel involved in the Miami and Merrill projects, who made the job of the evaluating team easier by their welcoming us, not as interlopers who might upset things, but as people with a serious function to perform These personnel include the principals, the assistant principals and others who were given special responsibilities for the projects, and all of the teachers of each of the schools in both projects.

Special thanks must be given to Dr. Philip A. Bolger of the Bureau of Educational Research, who made available to the evaluators his records as well as his thinking and suggestions, to Mrs. Celia Belfrom, Acting Assistant Director, Bureau of English, in charge of ESL and Bilingual Programs, who made her records and her fine staff available, and most especially to Mrs. Evelyn Kleban, the project coordinator for both the Merrill and the Miami Projects, who gave most graciously and willingly of her time and advice, and saw to it that all arrangements for interviews and classroom visitations were on schedule.

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgmennts	i
Preface	ii
Contents	iii
Tables	iv
I. Introduction	1
A. The Programs	1
B. Object and Procedures	2
C. Some Cautions	4
II. The Interviews and the Questionnaires for Teachers	9
A. General	9
B. The Merrill Project	14
C. The Miami Project	17
D. Summary	20
III. The Teacher and the Student Observation Checklists	21
IV. The Materials	24
A. Procedures	24
B. The Bank Street Readers	26
C. The Miami Linguistic Readers	34
D. The Merrill Linguistic Readers	39
V. Summary and Recommendations	50
A. Summary	50
B. Recommendations	52
VI. Footnotes	54
VII. Appendices	
A. Questionnaire for Teachers	56
B. Teacher Observation Checklist/Student Observation Checklist	58
C. Phonemic Symbols	61
D. Evaluation Team	62

TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Previous Teaching Experience	10
2.	Education and Training	11
3.	Experience with Other Materials	13
4.	Student Linguistic Background: Merrill	14
5.	Teacher Reactions: Merrill Program	15
6.	Teacher Preference: Merrill Program	16
7.	Student Linguistic Background: Miami	17
8.	Teacher Reactions: Miami Program	18
9.	Teacher Preference: Miami Program	20
10.	Word Count: Bank Street Readers	26
11.	Analysis of Sounds: Bank Street Readers	27
12.	Sound/Symbol Conflicts: Bank Street Readers	27, 28
13.	Word Count: Miami Readers	34
14.	Analysis of Sounds: Miami Readers	35
15.	Sound/Symbol Conflicts: Miami Readers	36
16.	Grammatical Patterns: Miami Readers	36, 37
17.	Word Count: Merrill Readers	39
18.	Analysis of Sounds: Merrill Readers	40
19.	Sound/Symbol Conflicts: Merrill Readers	40
20.	Words in Merrill Readers 1 and 2	46, 47
21.	Words in Bank Street Readers	48
22.	Words in First Four Miami Readers	49

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The Programs

During the academic year 1968-1969, the Title I ESEA sponsored "Teaching English as a Second Language in the Public Schools" (in the NYC Board of Education) was in its second of a projected three year program. The programs under this grant which are being considered in this evaluation are the Pilot Projects Using Linguistically-Oriented Materials and the Reception Class Project (Non-English).

The focus for the former is "on a linguistic approach to the teaching of beginning reading"[1] and for the latter "on teaching English to non-English speaking pupils (especially new arrivals from Puerto Rico) on helping them adjust to school life, and on teaching the fundamental skills."[2]

The Merrill Programs had been established in 1967 in a first grade class in each of eight schools in Brooklyn. Three of these schools have been dropped from the project as the result of decreasing enrollment in one school in an urban redevelopment area and for unspecified reasons in two other schools. In each of the remaining five schools, the first graders continued with the Merrill materials in the second grade and a new first grade class was initiated in '68-69.

The Miami program, instituted in a first grade class in each of eight schools in Manhattan 1967, was continued for the second grade for the students of the original first grade classes and in seven of the eight schools a new first grade class was initiated. The eighth school which has been involved in numerous experimental programs decided not to extend the programs.

The Reception Class Project, initiated in February 1968 on a pilot basis was

continued in three schools (one elementary school, one intermediate school and one senior high school) in Manhattan. It was not feasible to complete an evaluation of this project for a variety of reasons. During the academic year there were at least three different project directors appointed to head the project, the current director being appointed in mid-spring. Because of this, it was not possible to set up any visits to the schools until the week of the 19th of May. Each of the five classes visited was housed in a less than desirable room (poor lighting, too small, no black board). In one school, it was apparent that the so-called reception class project was no different than other ESL classes that had long before been established in that school.

As a result of these situations and in order to provide the new project director with more of an opportunity to gain supervisory control of the program, it was decided to delay any evaluation of the Reception Class Project until the third year of the program.

B. Objects and Procedures

The purpose of the evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of the teaching/learning situation as it involved the cited programs and to determine the effectiveness of the materials themselves with reference to the particular group of students with whom they were being used, namely students of English as a Second Language.

The report by the Bureau of Educational Research had included experimental data based on the Metropolitan, Clymer-Barrett, and Linguistic Capacity Index Tests and the results were either non-significant or favored the control group.[3]

Since th re is doubt that these tests should be used with non-native speakers of English because of the linguistic problems involved, it was decided that no normalized instruments would be used during the second year of the evaluation. This was coupled with a request from the Acting Assistant Director, Bureau of English in charge of ESL and Bilingual Programs (at the request of the Project Coordinators and the teachers

involved in each project) to the District Superintendents that the students involved in both the Merrill and Miami projects be omitted from the Metropolitan Reading Tests.[4]

This is not to suggest that no information could be obtained from such tests as the Metropolitan Reading Test. On the contrary, it is believed that pertinent data will be forthcoming from comparing the scores of those students with similar groups that have preceded or studied concurrently with them but who have used other materials. The problem, however, is one of timing. The NYU evaluating team believes that it would be much less frustrating to the children involved and much more meaningful in general if such comparisons were made at the completion of the projects when the non-native speakers would have had at least three years of exposure to English (see p. 25, last paragraph) and would have completed the whole course of study.

The use of any experimental data in this project, however, may be misleading. There are many variables impossible to control which are important factors in such a study, as Dr. Bolger suggested in his evaluation and in private discussions with Dr. Nadler. These include:

1. The background and training of the teachers
2. The number of years of experience of each teacher
3. The ethno-linguistic backgrounds of the children
4. The classroom methodology employed by the teachers
5. The amount of time devoted to the specific program by each teacher
6. The amount of supervisory assistance available
   a) from the Board of Education
   b) from the District Superintendent's office
   c) within the school itself
7. Pupil mobility

It will be seen that the data for these factors vary within each experimental group. Needless to say it would be difficult, if not impossible, to establish equivalents with the control groups as well.

The effect of the school strikes at the beginning of each of the first two years of the projects can never be measured. Though one can assume that the effect within a school would be the same, the same assumption could not be made on an inter-school basis.

The evaluation was to be based on interviews (with all classroom teachers, their principals and the person in charge for the program in each school), questionnaires for the teachers (see appendix A) a "Teacher Observation Checklist" and a "Student Observation Checklist" (See appendix B), containing built-in cross-referencing to the teacher Checklist, and a linguistic analysis of the materials (Merrill and Miami) with attention directed to 1) the number of new words (lexical, function); 2) an analysis of the sound system reflected in the text (with reference to initial, medial and final sounds [consonant and vowel] and clusters); 3) an analysis of the problems which might arise in sound versus spelling conflicts; and 4) an analysis of the grammatical patterns used in the texts.

In addition, for purposes of comparison, a similar analysis was to be carried out with one of the sets of basic readers, The Bank Street Readers, with the belief that clearcut differences or similarities between The Bank Street Series and the Merrill or the Miami Series would give validity to any claim that any resulting experimental difference between the control and experimental groups could have been or could not have been related to the differences between materials.

Two schools in each of the Miami and Merrill programs were selected for visitation and observation of the use of the respective materials. The teacher questionnaires and the Teacher and Student Observation Checklists were to be used at these schools.

C. Some Cautions

The objectives for the "Teaching English as a Second Language in the Public Schools" program as listed in the proposal summary form are:

1. To improve the pupil's achievement in understanding speaking, reading, and writing English.
2. To improve classroom performance in other skill areas.
3. To improve the child's self-image.
4. To improve social interactions with English speaking peers.[5]

However, that proposal also included three other projects not included in this evaluation:

3. Science-Spanish Project
5. Implementation of ESL program in grades K-12
6. Implementation of the New Programs of Family Living, including Sex Education ESL learners.

Nevertheless, the focus for the Miami and the Merrill Projects was limited to a linguistic approach to the teaching of reading.[6] This focus is emphasized by the objectives stated by the Assistant Director, Bureau of English, in charge of ESL and Bilingual programs in Information Sheets, wherein the objectives for the Merrill Project are stated as:

1. "To implement the Merrill Linguistic readers in the first grade in classes containing children learning English as a second language."
2. "To adapt the materials to the needs of the language learners"[7] and for the Miami project: "To determine the effectiveness of the Miami Reading Program upon English reading achievement of pupils learning English as a second language or dialect."[8]

Here for the first time is a new problem, a new variable, and a major question to be raised: Is teaching English as a Second Language the same as teaching English as a Second Dialect? The answer to this question is still being sought in experimental programs throughout the nation. Let the record show, however, the relevance of a statement made at the Georgetown Conference in March, 1969 by Dr. Virginia French Allen of Temple University to the effect that a major difference between the two is

that for second language learners nothing can be assumed and everything must be taught, but for second dialect learners testing should precede teaching to make certain that teachers do not teach what has already been learned.

In addition, it must be realized that the evaluation is to be concerned primarily with reading excluding the other objectives stated in the proposal to the extent that they can be excluded. Therein lies another major problem.

Unlike the native speaker of English who brings his language with him on the first day of school, the non-native speaker of English (if he is truly non-English) does not. This difference affects what the teacher can and must do in the classroom.

Every educator who has ever written or spoken about reading programs for beginning students in the primary grades has emphasized the need for language in these texts that reflects the experience of the child.

"Reading must be considered in relation to the other facets of language development: listening and speaking, which must precede it and writing, which ordinarily follows it. For a person learning to read a second language, the significance of a bedrock in language training must be underscored.

"A majority of the problems encountered in reading are actually spoken language difficulties."[9]

Oral production or speaking ability is "the ability to use in essentially normal communication situations the signaling systems of pronunciation, stress, intonation, grammatical structure, and vocabulary of the foreign language at a normal rate of delivery for native speakers of the language.[10]

The problems for the native speaker "in learning to read is reduced to merely recognizing the symbols that represent already familiar utterances and simultaneously relating them to relevant past experiences in order to grasp their full linguistic meaning."[11]

"The problems that arise from the difference between the foreign language and

the learner's native tongue emphasize that the first step in learning to read a foreign language must be familiarity with the new language."[12]

Talking about ESL in the Philippines in their introduction, Sutaria and Bowen say, "Even though basic readers prepared for native speakers of English are available they cannot be used to maximum advantage because they have not been prepared with special consideration for the needs of pupils with a specific non-English language background. These readers are based on the assumption that: (1) The pupils who will read them have gained automatic mastery of the sound and structure of English well before they begin to read the language, (2) their pronunciation habits are already firmly set, (3) their pronunciation habits will be influenced little if at all by their reading, and (4) they are able to form a wide variety of conceptualizations directly from stimuli in English, that is, think in the language. These assumptions are seldom true for non-native speakers of English, when they start formal book reading in their second language.

"During the early stages of learning to read a second language, children need basic readers that are easy enough to permit successful reading, yet not so simple that they offer no challenge. They should contain material which appeals to the children in spite of a relatively light vocabulary and structural load. Such books afford pupils an opportunity to experience success at a stage when it is necessary as a spur to learning..."[13]

All of this points to the need for a total ESL program for the non-native speaking child, without which a focus on the beginning reading situation is wasted. Unless the linguistic reading projects have a sound foundation in ESL underlying them and an on-going ESL program concurrent with them, the whole is without value. Reading is not learned in vacuo; it is part of the language learning program and process.

The question of what a non-native speaking child is is also a problem. For some it is anyone whose last name sounds Spanish. For others it is any pupil who is rated

D, E, or F on the "Scale for Rating Pupil's ability to Speak English," and for still others it is any pupil who is rated other than "A" on the scale. (See Scale, below.) Throughout this report it will be impossible to state what is meant by the term non-native speaker, though to the evaluating team a trace of an accent is relatively unimportant in comparison with good use of grammatical structure and well-chosen vocabulary in speech and writing, and an ability to understand oral and written English at a level appropriate to the student's maturity. Since the rating scale depends on subjective criteria, the evaluating team was pleased to learn that it is being replaced by another form, hopefully a more objective one.

Scale for Rating Pupil's Ability to Speak English.[14]

Enter for each pupil the letter A, B, C, D, E, F corresponding to his estimated ability to speak English in the classroom, defined as follows:

A. Speaks English, for his age level, like a native—with no foreign accent or hesitancy due to interference of a foreign language.

B. Speaks English with a foreign accent, but otherwise approximates the fluency of a native speaker of like age level. Does not hesitate because he does not search for English words and language forms.

C. Can speak English well enough for most situations met by typical native pupils of like age, but still must make a conscious effort to avoid the language forms of some foreign language. Depends, in part, upon translation of words and expressions from the foreign language into English, and therefore, speaks hesitantly upon occasion.

D. Speaks English in more than a few stereotyped situations, but speaks it haltingly at all times.

E. Speaks English only in those stereotyped situations for which he has learned a few useful words and expressions.

F. Speaks no English.

II. The Interviews and the Questionnaires for Teachers (See Appendix "A")

The informal interviews that were conducted with all of the teachers, and the principals and/or the individual given the responsibility of the programs at each school reflected the same questions that were included on the questionnaires for teachers which were utilized only at the four schools (two in each project) in which the observations were conducted. Since many of the questions were of a general nature with information pertinent to the general background of the teachers, this section will be broken down into three parts. A. General – pertinent to both the Miami and the Merrill Projects, B. Specific reference to Merrill, C. Specific reference to Miami.

In all parts the trends suggested by the questionnaires closely if not completely reflected the attitudes and responses indicated during the informal interviews; divergences are noted in the body of the report.

A. General:

Questions 1 through 10, and 17 reflect the teachers' background, training and experience. Most of the questions were open-ended and have been grouped as to (a) previous teaching experience (questions #1, 3, 6), (b) background and training (questions 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 17), (c) experience with other materials (questions 4, 5, 11), (d) pupil attitudes (questions 19, 20).

Table 1 indicates the frequency of responses for the eleven responding teachers (100%) to items 1, 3, and 6. For this and for other Tables, where the interviews elicited different responses, these are noted in the narrative.

TABLE I: PREVIOUS TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Item		Responses		
		# of teachers	# of years	%
1.	How long have you been teaching?	1	1	9%
		3	2	27%
		5	4	46%
		1	6	9%
		1	14	9%
2.	How much previous experience have you had at this grade level?	3	none	27%
		1	1	9%
		3	2	27%
		3	3	27%
		1	11	9%
6.	Have you taught ESL students before? How long?	Yes 11	% 100	No 0 % 0
		1	½	9%
		7	1	64%
		1	2	9%
		1	4	9%
		1	12	9%
Where? All teachers indicated that their experience was at their current school.				

Table I indicates that a majority of the teachers had four years or less experience teaching. The percentages hold true for experience at the grade level and with ESL students. In the informal interviews with all of the teachers, the same fact was consistent: The majority of the teachers in the program had fewer than five years experience. One exception to this pattern was a school in Manhattan (Miami) where all of the teachers involved had at least four years of experience.

Questions 2, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 17 concerned the academic training received by the teachers and their responses can be seen in Table 2.

TABLE 2: EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Item		Responses			
2.	Please list degrees held and specialization:	A.A.	Bachelor's	Master's	
Degrees:		1	11	6	
		Undergraduate		Graduate	
Specialization:		# teachers	%	# teachers	%
Early Childhood		5	46%	4	67%
Ed. Psych. – Remedial Reading				2	33%
Music		2	18%		
English		1	9%		
Political Science		1	9%		
Psychology		1	9%		
Italian		1	9%		

7.	Have you had any ESL training?	# teachers	%
none		7	64%
In-service courses		3	27%
Course at Brooklyn College (Tchng. Engl. to Speech Handicapped)		1	9%

8.	Have you had any training in linguistics? Please list courses.	Yes	%	No	%
		4	36%	7	64%

9.	How were you trained for this program?	# teachers	%
Attended Merrill or Miami workshops		6	55%
On-job training		2	18%
Project Director assistance & conversations with other teachers		2	18%
Several lectures after the term began		1	9%

10.	What additional training would you like to have, if any? (Listed on questionnaire.)	# teachers	%
a.	additional lectures	2	18%
b.	periodic formal seminars	3	27%
c.	structured informal seminar	5	46%
d.	discussion groups	2	18%
e.	Please list any other	3	27%

17.	What languages have you studied?	# teachers	%
Spanish		9	82%
French		5	46%
German		1	9%
Italian		1	9%
Hebrew		1	9%

Items 2, 7, and 8 indicate that a majority of the teachers have gone on for advanced degrees but that their training at both the undergraduate and graduate levels reflects little or no background in linguistics or in ESL methodology. The four respondents who answered yes to question 8 had each had one linguistics course. The in-service courses referred to were the orientation programs provided by the respective publishers of the materials (D. C. Heath for the Miami and Charles Merrill for the Merrill), plus a one day in-service course for each program provided by the project coordinator of each program. The informal interviews indicated the same pattern except that more teachers had had some exposure to ESL methodology either in a semester long in-service course offered through The Board or at one of the local colleges.

Despite a serious commitment on the part of the Board of Education to provide an orientation program as noted above, only six of the eleven teachers responding attended the publisher-sponsored workshops. This, however, was still a major improvement over the no-training experienced by almost all of the teachers during the first year of the project.[15] The interviews indicated that a majority of the teachers had, in fact, attended the workshops. In the informal interviews several of the teachers indicated that they had not really understood what they had been doing during the first year they were involved in the project, but that their attendance at the orientation workshops had made a major contribution to the success they felt they were having during the second year. This effect could also have been the result of the teachers having had the experience of a year of teaching with the respective materials behind them.

Three teachers felt that no additional training was necessary in question 10 and three teachers indicated under "other," such activities as inter-school visitation, demonstration classes, and dissemination of information as new ideas are available. One teacher indicated that the training she received would have been better had the personnel who provided the training been better informed themselves, including both the

publishers' representatives and the project coordinator. This however was a minority opinion.

With one exception the respondents to question 17 indicated that their proficiency was either poor or fair with reference to listening, speaking, reading and writing ability in the foreign languages which they had studied though, in the interviews, several teachers indicated that they could function quite well in Spanish.

Questions 4, 5 and 11 were related to the teachers' use of other materials and how they compared with the "linguistically oriented" materials.

TABLE 3: EXPERIENCE WITH OTHER MATERIALS

Item	Responses	
4. What other reading materials have you used? Please list.	# teachers	%
none	3	27%
Scott-Foresman	7	64%
Bank Street	5	46%
Other	4	36%
5. What other ESL materials have you used?		
none	8	73%
Language Arts Bulletin (K-2)	2	18%
Board of Education Curriculum Guide for Teaching the Puerto Rican	3	27%
Other	2	18%
11. How does this program compare with other materials you have listed?		
no response	3	27%
favorable	5	46%
unfavorable	3	27%

Table 3 indicates that though a majority of the teachers had had previous experience with other reading materials, (item 4), only a minority had had experience with other ESL materials, (item 5). The informal interviews gave similar results for other reading materials but more diversified experience with ESL materials than was indicated by the responses to the questionnaire.

The responses to item 11 as indicated in Table 3 do not give an accurate picture of the teachers' attitudes. All who responded did not give clear-cut favorable or unfavorable responses and a better picture can be obtained by looking at Tables 5 (p. 15) and 6 (p. 16) under the Merrill, and Tables 8 (p. 18) and 9 (p. 20) under the Miami, specific program responses.

Items 19 and 20 were designed to see pupil reactions, based on absentee rates and any polarization that might exist in the classes. The highest absentee rate indicated was two or three students a day and no significant polarization was indicated other than by groups of friends and separation by sexes.

B. The Merrill Project

Of the eleven teachers polled at the four schools on the questionnaires, seven were from two schools, (four at one and three at the other) in the Merrill program.

Item 18 dealt with the linguistic background of the students and items 12 through 16 dealt with teacher reactions to the materials.

TABLE 4: STUDENT LINGUISTIC BACKGROUND

Item	Responses					
18. What is the student makeup of your class?		#	%		#	%
	male	66	50	female	65	50
	native	35	27	non-native	96	73

	#	%
non-native:		
Spanish	92	96
Dutch	1	1
French	1	1
non-specified	2	2

As could be expected a large majority of the non-native students were of Spanish-speaking background. Of the native speakers, both white and blacks were seen in the

classes observed, though the interviewees indicated that a clear majority of the native-speaking students in their classes were black.

TABLE 5: TEACHER REACTIONS (Merrill Program)

Item	Responses # tchrs.	% of all tchrs.
12. What are the major advantages of this program, if any?		
structured	4	56
learn to spell	3	42
word attack	5	70
learn and retain more words	1	14
children can work well independently	1	14
13. What are the major disadvantages of this program, if any?		
none	2	28
non-useful vocabulary	2	28
no pictures	1	14
no supplementary reading	1	14
boring for slow children	1	14
over-structured for absent child !	1	14
14. Is there anything you would like to see incorporated into these materials?		
nothing	1	14
pictures for introducing vocabulary	5	70
more supplementary "ideas"	2	28
pictures in the text	1	14
records: words for auditory discrimination	1	14
pictures in sequence for discussion	2	28

Questions 12-14 Table 5, deal with teachers' perceptions of the material and indicate that the teachers seem to see more advantages than disadvantages though not to the extent that there is not room for improvement. During the interviews, several teachers (albeit a minority) indicated that they too would prefer to see pictures in the textbooks, an indication that they had still not truly understood the philosophy of the approach. Almost all of the teachers saw the same advantages, some mentioning the control of grammatical structure patterns as well. All of the teachers found some of the vocabulary "non-useful," a fault that could not be denied on any grounds other than what the patterned format permitted as well as restricted.

A clear majority of the teachers interviewed stated that pictures external to the text (or flashcards or other visual aids) would be a great help in introducing new vocabulary, an indication of their awareness of the need for oral control prior to the actual exposure to the written form. On the other hand, a small but vociferous minority complained about the lack of supplementary reading material, again lacking awareness of the frustrations students would encounter in being exposed to relatively (if not completely) unstructured materials.

Several raised valid questions about the problem of articulation confronting a student who might go to a school where the Merrill materials were not available. This is a real problem while the experiment is going on, and the only solution that might be offered would be to have the project coordinator request that the ESL coordinator in that school or district continue to work privately with any such students.

The teachers varied in the amount of time they devoted to the reading materials: about 67% using these one period a day whereas about 33% used them for two periods a day. This discrepancy is a serious factor in any attempt to maintain controls in such an experiment.

Progress made by the pupils over the first two years of the program ranged from completion of two books to near completion of the sixth book (80 pages in the first two books, 94 in book three, 112 in 4, 128 in five, and 192 in 6) varying for groups in each class in each school. This is, of course, no different from student achievement rates with any set of reading materials.

Table 6: TEACHER PREFERENCE (Merrill Program)

Items	Responses Yes	%	No	%	Undecided
15. If the choice were yours would you want to use these materials again?	5	71	2	29	-
16. Would you recommend these materials to your colleagues?	6	86	0	0	1 14

Table 6 indicates that despite any reservations the teachers may have about the Merrill materials, on the whole they were in favor of using them and recommending them to colleagues. The one teacher who was undecided indicated that she would prefer to wait in order to see the kind of progress her students would make. This was her first year in the project. A clear majority of the teachers who had used the materials during both years of the program were in favor of continuing. A clear majority of teachers with little previous experience were in favor too. Only a minority of those with five or more years of experience favored another set of materials, Scott Foresman or Bank Street.

Many of the teachers indicated that they had told their friends at other schools about the materials in the hope that the materials could be made available to their friends as well.

C. The Miami Project

Had the informal interviews not taken place as well, it would have been a problem to suggest that the data from the questionnaires for teachers in the Miami program was meaningful since there were only four teachers in the two schools selected, and one teacher dissenting provides a 25% minority. Nevertheless, the information reflected in the tables below (7, 8, 9) supported by the informal interviews, gives an accurate picture of teacher attitudes towards the Miami program.

Table 7: STUDENT LINGUISTIC BACKGROUND

Item	Responses					
18. What is the Student makeup of your class?		#	%		#	%
	male	51	54	female	45	46
	native	10	10	non-native	87	90
Non-Native:	#	%				
Spanish	43	49				
Chinese	41	47				
French	1	1				
Yugoslav	1	1				
Unspecified	1	1				

Since the evaluating team was interested in the responses of teachers working with New York City's second largest minority, the Chinese, Table 7 indicates a considerably smaller overall percentage of Spanish-speaking non-native students, although the actual percentage in all the schools is considerably greater 75% if not more. Again, based on the informal interviews, a clear majority of the native-speaking students in these classes were black.

Table 8: TEACHER REACTIONS (Miami Program)

Item	Responses # tchrs.	% of all tchrs.
12. What are the major advantages of this program, if any?		
structured	1	25
good oral communication	3	75
comic strip	2	50
recognizes fact children do not have language	1	25
13. What are the major disadvantages of this program, if any?		
no reinforcement	3	75
confusing patterns	1	25
inconsistency of presentation	1	25
insufficient material	1	25
too slow for bright kids	2	50
children respond better to phonetic approach	1	25
14. Is there anything you would like to see incorporated into these materials?		
nothing	1	25
letter/word/sentence-concept	2	50
more reinforcement and enrichment material	1	25
Use of language master for pupils who start late	1	25

In item 12, the heavy emphasis on oral/communication built into the Miami program was appreciated by a majority of the teachers (including those interviewed). Many but not a majority called attention to the fact that the grammatical structures

were controlled and that students were not exposed to many at the same time. (See p. 36, 37.) Still others, but not nearly as many as the 50% in Table 8 might suggest were impressed with the comic strip character approach and the "talking" animals.

The major disadvantage found in item 13 was a lack of built-in reinforcement, primarily of individual words which might be used once and never reappear. This criticism was consistent with all of the teachers interviewed. None of the other disadvantages listed in Table 8 received what could be called a large minority of negative votes. Many teachers responded that the materials were slow for bright children or fast for slow children, but since the materials do not prescribe the speed at which the teacher should go, it was believed that these comments reflected the teachers' own patience or lack thereof.

Despite the desire to see more work on the letter/word/sentence concept on the part of fifty percent of the respondents in Item 14 there was no evidence of this being a majority attitude with all of the teachers surveyed, though a large minority were concerned about the lack of sound/symbol fit in "so-called structured materials." (See p. 36.)

As with the Merrill respondents, there was variation in the amount of time devoted to these materials; however, the range was much greater: from a thirty minute period daily to "as much time as I can possibly devote. The children must have language before they can learn anything else." All told, about thirty percent devoted approximately one period a day, about 50 percent approximately 2 periods, and about twenty percent were in the "as much as possible" category.

The range of pupil progress was as wide as with the Merrill with some pupils completing all but the last three or four books in the series of 21 booklets (2 of 24 pages, 7 of 32 pages, 12 of 48 pages.

Table 9: TEACHER PREFERENCE (Miami Program)

Item	Responses Yes	%	Yes, but	%	No	%
15. If the choice were yours, would you want to use these materials again?	1	25	3	75		–
16. Would you recommend these materials to colleagues?	4	100	-	-		–

Paralleling the responses of the teachers in the Merrill program, the teachers of the Miami program were again overwhelmingly in favor of recommending the materials to colleagues, item 16, although three of the respondents did have reservations (reflected in Table 8). The majority of those interviewed had no hesitation in saying that they would choose to use these materials again. A minority group of teachers with more than five years experience again favoring one of the standard reading programs.

D. Summary

The informal interviews and questionnaires for teachers indicated that:

1) A majority of the teachers involved in the projects have less than five years teaching experience.

2) Teachers have relatively little or no training in linguistics and/or ESL methodology.

3) Teachers had received more preparation this year than they had last year.

4) The pupil populations do not consist of non-native speaking children only.

5) The majority of non-native speaking children speak Spanish.

6) For each program, the majority of the teachers favor the programs in spite of the shortcomings they perceive.

7) There was a broad range of program implementation for each project.

III. THE TEACHER AND THE STUDENT OBSERVATION CHECKLISTS
(See Appendix B)

Prior to the visits to the schools in the spring of 1969, the New York University evaluation team prepared a weighted checklist for the purpose of evaluating teacher performance. It contained a supplementary Student Observation checklist for the purpose of eliciting similar information from the students' perspective. The checklist was prepared with English as a Second Language techniques and procedures in mind.

During the informal interviews with all of the teachers in both programs it became obvious that the majority of the teachers had been specifically trained in how to employ their respective materials (those who had been teaching the previous year and/or had attended the orientation workshops), but had little or no linguistic or ESL training. (See Table 2, Page 11). Too, the principals at almost every school the team visited were concerned that their teachers might become possible scapegoats in the event that the projects proved unsatisfactory. (This was not stated as a reason by any principal but their remarks were so interpreted by the evaluation team, which must bear the responsibility of any possible misinterpretation.)

The combination of these two factors: the background and training of the teachers and their principals' desires to seemingly protect them, was the reason that no "formal" observation was made by the evaluating team.

The evaluators, divided into two two-man teams, were in each classroom, for two days for at least one hour each day. It was the original intention of the evaluation team to spend the entire morning in the classrooms but many of the principals balked, pointing out that the average visit by regular school personnel was usually only 40 minutes or less.

Since two members of the evaluation team were present at all of the informal interviews, which preceded the visitations, no teacher was confronted by two unknown outsiders in his classroom during the visitations. Every teacher had met one of the two evaluators.

There was a wide range of teacher effectiveness, attitude, ability to maintain discipline, awareness of student needs, and awareness of the difference between testing and teaching. Of the eleven teachers visited, only in two instances did the evaluating team think that the teacher was functioning ineffectively. The remaining teachers (nine) were functioning at average or above average level with three teachers being considered excellent.

The lack of linguistic training showed up in teachers' unawareness of why students were having difficulty. One teacher when a student said "hi*n*" instead of "hi*m*" had the pupil repeat several words which began with the letter and sound "m." With linguistic training that teacher would have realized that Spanish-speaking children have difficulty with the *final* "m" sound but not with the initial. The same types of problems occurred with grammatical patterns that were, indeed, similar but nevertheless different.

Some of the teachers did not provide enough oral practice with the words before asking the children to read them and some teachers provided no oral practice at all but went directly to the blackboard or the textbook.

Teacher directions sometimes stopped at the verbal when the show-me step was necessary.

In one class a record was used giving instructions in Spanish, which is a questionable technique since most of the students spoke and understood English, but even more so when the students included two students with no knowledge of Spanish.

Too often a student mistake went uncorrected because the teacher did not hear the mistake or did not bother to correct it. Although a teacher cannot and should not correct every mistake, a teacher must become aware that every uncorrected mistake may become part of that child's habit patterns. Incorrect patterns must be unlearned before they can be relearned. Until a teacher can say with certainty that the mistake will not be learned as a habit, she should correct the student. Teachers' fear that students will become frustrated and "tune out" is unwarranted if the teacher knows how to correct the child without focusing attention on the child.

Strong positive values seen, included - - a) in every class students were grouped according to their performance ability and were thus able to work on their own in groups or individually, b) the students in most of the classes were attentive indicating that their teachers were giving them what they needed, c) except for occasional newcomers (students enter the classes throughout the academic year), the students seemed to understand what the teachers said and what was expected of them, d) several teachers used the vocabulary taught in that day's lesson in art and other classroom activities, and e) children were also asked by several of the teachers to pantomime their understanding of a particular vocabulary item.

Whether the licensing of ESL teachers will have strong positive effects on the training and eventual classroom performance of ESL teachers remains to be seen. For now though, little more could be asked for in the dedication and sincerity of the teachers seen during the evaluation. There is room for improvement, however, in general effectiveness with ESL techniques and procedures.

The checklists prepared for this evaluation should provide information of value to the ESL teachers, coordinators and supervisors. (See Appendix "B")

IV. THE MATERIALS

A. Procedures

The analysis of the materials, Merrill, Miami, and Bank Street extends approximately through the first one hundred pages of text material. The reason for this being that by that point either a firm linguistic foundation would have been established or not.

The questions to be answered in this analysis are:

1. Is the Bank Street series truly linguistically oriented?
2. Is the Merrill material truly linguistically oriented?
3. Is the Miami material truly linguistically oriented?

The criteria to be employed for determining linguistic orientation include:

1. The number of new words. (Inflections will not be treated as new words.)
   a. content or lexical items (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs)
   b. structure or function words (auxiliaries, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, determiners, wh-words)
2. An analysis of the sound system reflected in the text
   a. consonants: initial, medial, final
   b. vowels including diphthongs
   c. consonant clusters
3. An analysis of sound/symbol conflicts
4. An analysis of the grammatical patterns used in the texts.

Intonation patterns will be omitted since they must remain conjectural, as would stream-of-speech pronunciation. Isolated word pronunciation was used as a compromise.

Before entering into the analysis of the materials, certain facts should be kept in mind. A reading program is not an ESL program. Success in learning for second language learners is "limited unless there is a carefully planned program of instruction in English as a second language." [16]

In providing instruction, the teacher should use "the audio-lingual approach. The pupil's first contact with the new language materials is through the ear. Emphasis is placed

on meaningful oral practice of what he has heard. When oral mastery is acquired, reading, then writing follow to reinforce and strengthen oral control of basic content. [17]

One must realize that the second language learner

a. "tends not to hear the sounds which do not occur in his native language,

b. "tends to substitute from his own language sounds which approximate those of the new language,

c. "needs assistance to help him hear the new sounds and reproduce them,

d. "needs to hear and imitate a clear model of the language spoken without exaggeration of tempo, rhythm, intonation and stress,

e. "should understand that meaning is communicated through the pitch, pauses, elisions, stress, rhythm, intonation, tempo, and word order of the new language"[18] as well as word meanings, structure (function) words, inflectional and derivational affixes.

The second language learner "should have many opportunities to practice sentence patterns and correct forms of the new language *in a systematic progression that builds each new segment on one already learned."* He needs practice drills that provide numerous repetitions, an essential in achieving *automatic control and fluency* in the new language. (all italics added)

An essential ingredient not discussed in the Handbook cited above is time. A language is not acquired merely through exposure to various facets of the language. A great deal of practice, repetition and continued reinforcement, all essential ingredients in the acquisition of a second language, requires time. It must be pointed out that the success of the Miami program in the Dade County schools was built on a foundation of approximately three hours a day of English as a second language for the non-independents, "students whose command of English is so limited that they cannot follow directions or carry on a simple conversation in English. They cannot express their basic needs in English. These pupils are grouped together for instruction in English as a second

language. . .multi-grade groups of non-independents are formed, so that their language needs can be efficiently met." [19]

Unless students are grouped according to their linguistic needs, and this precludes heterogeneous grouping of native and non-native students, and unless they are provided with intensive programs in ESL, experimental programs such as those covered in this evaluation, if not doomed to outright failure, have been deprived of the optimum conditions conducive to success.

The forthcoming licensing of teachers of ESL should provide the City of New York with a sufficient number of trained teachers to provide the non-native speaking pupils with the kinds of ESL programs that will break down the linguistic barrier which prevents their success in the school system and prevents them from their opportunities to break out of socio-economic ghettos. If they cannot speak, read, and write, they can neither get good jobs, nor the opportunity to obtain a higher education.

B. The Bank Street Readers

The two pre-primers *In the City* and *People Read* contain approximately one hundred pages (96) and will be used for the analysis.

1. **The Number of New Words:** a list of all the words appears in Table 21, p. 48.

Table 10: WORD COUNT

	# of pages	# of words*				
		lexical	%	function	%	total
In the City	32	15	54	13	46	28
People Read	64	37	66	19	34	56
Total:	96	52	62	32	38	84

*does not include inflections of the same word, all of which are counted as one word.

2. The Sound System of Isolated Words in the Texts

Table 11: ANALYSIS OF SOUNDS

		Different Sounds-Totals	In the City # of Sounds	In the City The Sounds*	People Read # of New Sounds	People Read The Sounds*
A.	Vowels	11				
	1. Initial	6	4	(25, 28, 29, 34)	2	(30, 31)
	2. Final	6	5	(24, 26, 30, 33, 34)	1	(29)
	3. Other	11	7	(24, 25, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34)	4	(26, 28, 29, 30)
B.	Diphthongs	3				
	1. Initial	2	1	(37)	1	(35)
	2. Final	0	0	-	2	(35, 36)
	3. Other	3	3	(35, 36, 37)	0	--
C.	Consonants	20		(1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10		
	1. Initial	17	13	17, 20, 21, 22, 38)	4	(3, 12, 14, 23)
	2. Final	12	7	(1, 5, 8, 10, 2, 21, 22)	5	(3, 7, 9, 11, 13)
	3. Other	8	3	(1, 8, 10)	5	(7, 13, 17, 21, 22)
D.	Clusters	15				
	1. Initial	7	4	(10 + 2 (+22); 10 + 3; 16 + 22)	3	(12 + 21, 22; 2 + 22)
	2. Final	7	1	(22 + 3)	6	(5, 7, 8 + 11; 2, 3 + 10; 8 + 18)
	3. Other	2	0		2	(8 + 18; 3 + 22)

*See Appendix "C" for sounds which correspond to these numbers.

3. Analysis of Sound/Symbol Conflicts

Table 12: SOUND/SYMBOL CONFLICTS*

A. SAME SOUND, DIFFERENT SPELLING

1. In the City		2. People Read	
Sound**	Spelling	Sound**	Spelling
# 3	work, school	# 3	come, truck
#10	city, street	#20	who, he
#24	people, street, city	#26	mailman, day
#29	on, are	#27	red, says
#34	the, up	#34	run, come, a
#34 + 22	work, girls	#33	who, room
#37	out, down	#31	morning, all
#38	one, work	#35	fly, high, I

Table 12: (Cont'd.)

B. SAME SPELLING, DIFFERENT SOUND

In the City		People Read	
Spelling	Sound in the Word. . .	Spelling	Sound in the Word. . .
a	many, are, and	a	all, man
s	lights, house, houses	ay	say, says
th	the, three	c	city, come
w	work, two, down	ch	school, lunch
		I	I, It
		o	stop, who, over, morning, come
		oo	look, room

*This list is not complete.
**See Appendix "C" for sounds which correspond to these numbers.

4. Analysis of Grammatical Patterns

a. In the City

1. Noun Phrases (NP)

a) Determiner + Noun: where D = one, two, three, many, the or ϕ (zero)
N = singular or plural common nouns

b) Compound NP: NP + and + NP (+ and + NP)

c) Pronoun: they

2. Function Shift

a) street functions as a noun and as a noun modifier

b) in, down, up, and on function as adverbs and prepositions

c) on also functions as a verb particle

3. Prepositional Phrases (Prep. Phr.)

a) Without determiners:

1) singular noun: in school; to school

2) plural noun: in stores; to stores

b) With determiners:

1) singular noun: in the city; to one house, up the street; down the street

2) plural noun: in the houses; in many stores; in many houses; on many streets

4. Sentence Patterns ("S")*

a) NP + are + Prep. Phr.	People are in the houses.
b) NP + Verb (intransitive) + Prep. Phr.	People go to stores.
c) NP + V (int.) + Adverb (+ and + adverb)	People go in and out.
d) NP + V (int.) + Prep. Phr. + Prep. Phr.	They go to work in the city.
e) NP + V (int.) + adv. + Prep. Phr.	They go up to work.
f) "S" + and + "S"	They go up to work, and they go down.
g) V (imperative) + adverb	Run in, (run out).
h) V (imper.) + adv. + and + adv.	Run up and down.
i) NP + V (int.)	Two girls run.
j) NP + V (int.) + particle + Prep. Phr.	Lights go on in stores and houses
k) Prep. Phr., NP + V + particle	In the city, lights go on.

*All subject NP's are plural.

b. People Read

1. New Noun Phrases

a) New Pronouns:	he, who, she, it, I
b) New Determiners:	a, some, her, all, Ann's
c) Proper Nouns:	Ann, Ben
d) D + adj. + noun:	a good day
e) Adjective phrase:	a red light on the truck

2. Function Shift

a) All functions as an adverb, an adjective, and a determiner

b) Morning functions as a noun and a noun modifier

c) Fire functions as an interjection, a noun, and a noun modifier

d) Over functions as an adjective, a preposition, and an adverb.

e) Out functions as an adjective, an adverb, and a particle.

3. New Propositional Phrases (including contrasts with phrases used In the City)

in school	in stores	in the school in the store in the lunchroom in the morning	
on fire	on streets	on the truck	
to school	to schools	to the city	
to lunch		to the lunchroom	to Ben
at school at night	(look up)	at the sky	
		into the store into a store	
	over streets	over the city	

Notice all of the combinations with school; the contrast between at night and in the morning; the presence or absence of a determiner; singular and plural nouns.

4. New Sentence Patterns

a) Compound Prep. Phr.	They read on streets and in stores.
b) And + "S"	And they read in school.
c) NP (singular) + V + s	The morning sun comes up.
d) "S," they say.	"Good morning," they say.
e) Who are they?	
f) Who is he?	
g) NP + is + NP	He is the store man.
h) NP + are + Prep. Phr.	Ann and her mother are at school.
i) "Hi," says the father. (Inversion)	
j) NP + says, "S."	Ann says, Good-by, Mother."
k) V (imperative) + NP	Have a good day.
l) Is + NP + adjective?	Is the lunch good?

m) NP + is + adjective.	It is good.
n) Adverbial NP + "S"	Some day I will have a truck.
o) NP + will + V (+ NP)	I will have a truck.
p) NP + will + say + "S" + prep. phr.	I will say "HI" to all the people.
q) NP + will + V + infinitive of purpose + NP	People will come to see the boys.
r) NP + will + all + V + NP	They will all have ice cream.
s) NP + V (past) + NP + Particle	The store man put it out.
t) Passive Voice	. . . is put on the truck.
u) NP + V + particle + adverb	They fly up high.
v) On and on, NP + V	
w) Will + NP + V + adv.?	Will they come back?

5. Verb + adverb/particle combinations

a) come up; come out; come over to; come back; come back to; come on

b) go up to; go down to; go on (continue); go away; go down

c) put out (extinguish)

d) fly up; fly down; fly away; fly on (continue)

e) look at; look up at

5. Are the Bank Street Readers linguistically oriented?

Thirty eight percent of the 84 words used in the two pre-primers are function words, those little grammar words that do not contain referents in the real world and which are the most difficult to learn in any language. To be learned effectively by non-native speakers these words have to be introduced in very small doses. Related to this problem is the number of prepositions used in the two texts, eight, and the ten determiners, six pronouns, and seventeen verb plus particle or adverb combinations. Such combinations as *Come up, go on,* and *look at* are difficult to learn as individual phrases. When they appear on the same pages with *come out, come over to, come back* and *come*

back to; go up to, go down to, go on, go away, and *go down;* and *look up at,* they become insurmountable problems for a non-native learner. Content words are much easier to learn, especially for non-native learners since these words provide a point of reference in the real world for children to hold on to.

All of the vowel and diphthong sounds which are used in English appear on the first 96 pages. Only three consonant sounds are missing (# 15, 18, 19), see Appendix "C" for correspondence between the numbers listed here and the sounds. Ten consonant clusters (two or more consonants unseparated by a vowel) appear in addition to the five clusters which are a result of the plural morpheme "-s." (See Table 11.) The final "s" inflections in English, plural and possessive on nouns and third person singular on verbs, have three different pronunciations depending on the last sound of the uninflected word; the "s" may be pronounced /S,Z/or/IZ/. All three of these appear in the two pre-primers. Most important is the /IZ/ because of the sight versus sound problem. Though it appears only once, the word is "houses," which contains an additional problem because the "s" in house is pronounced /s/, but the same "s" in houses is pronounced /z/. (See Table 12.) Native speakers are usually not even aware that they make this change, a non-native would be confused. A related problem can be seen in the two words *stores* and *houses.* In both of these an "s" is added to the singular form; yet, in the former the "s" is pronounced /z/, in the latter /Iz/. Although it does not appear in these two texts, imagine the confusion which will occur when the student finds that the "s" in *cakes* is pronounced /s/. There is no consistency of symbol/sound relationship in this set of readers.

The student who is introduced to *stores* (p. 14 *In The City)* before he meets *store* may spell the singular form *stor.* He has no way of knowing when to add *s* and when *es.*

The problems with the function words mentioned above recur in all of the grammatical sentence patterns, for the various function words appear in each. Too, students are introduced to many plural nouns before the singular is introduced, though there appears to be a valid purpose for this in that the present tense verb forms do not require

"s" with plural nouns. It might have been wiser still not to use the simple present tense altogether however, for its use is misleading. When a student can see a picture and read about it the impression that this is occurring now is very strong. If it is occurring now, however, the use of the present continuous tense (be + Verb + ing) is called for. Nevertheless, the singular nouns are used in the simple present tense forms on the fortieth page (p. 8 of *People Read).* Precluding this problem could have been achieved by introducing singular nouns with *is* as the main verb. Then the plural forms with *are*, followed by plural noun plus simple present of other verbs, and singular noun plus simple present (with "s"). The same problem appears of course on p. 10 in *In The City*, where a plural noun and *are (People are in the houses.)* are introduced before a singular noun with *is.* Young children will have a problem attempting to pluralize uninflected *people* or find a singular form for it.

Another grammatical problem occurs with the use of the verb/particle combinations *put out* (meaning extinguish) and *go on* (continue). The former is transitive and is separable from its object. The latter is intransitive and inseparable. *Go on* is also used to mean (lights) *are turned on.* It is possible to say "The store man put it out." or *The store man put the fire out.* It is also possible to say *The store man put out the fire,* but not *The store man put out it.* One must also ask about the utility or frequency of such a phrase as *the store man.*

A positive feature in these readers is the careful repetition of almost every grammatical pattern used in the texts, several times, as is the case with the high frequency with which every word is used.

All in all, however, the student has little or nothing to hold onto in terms of a true "systematic progression that builds each new segment on one already learned." [20]

Although the Bank Street Readers are not linguistically oriented, they were not intended to be since they were prepared with native speakers in mind. Even native-speakers, however, might become confused with some of the problems indicated above.

C. The Miami Linguistic Readers

The first four readers, *Biff and Tiff, Kid Kit and the Catfish, Nat the Rat,* and *Tug Duck and Buzz Bug* contain approximately one hundred pages (108) and will be used for the analysis.

1. **The Number of New Words:** a list of all the words appears in Table 22, p. 57.

Table 13: WORD COUNT

	# of pages	# of words*				
		lexical	%	function	%	total
Biff . . .	23	5	71	2	29	7
Kid Kit. . . .	23	14	87	2	13	16
Nat the Rat	31	18	78	5	22	23
Tug Duck . . .	31	23	88	3	12	26
Total:	108	60	83	12	17	72

* does not include inflections of the same word, all of which are counted as one word.

2. The Sound System of Isolated Words in the Texts

Table 14: ANALYSIS OF SOUNDS

		Different Sounds-Totals		Biff and Tiff # of Sounds	Biff and Tiff The Sounds*	Kid Kit and Catfish # of Sounds	Kid Kit and Catfish The Sounds*	Nat the Rat # of Sounds	Nat the Rat The Sounds	Tug Duck and Buzz Bug # of Sounds	Tug Duck and Buzz Bug The Sounds
A.	Vowels		3								
	1. Initial	3		2	(25, 28)	1	(34)	0	-	0	-
	2. Final	1		0	-	1	(34)	0	-	0	-
	3. Other	3		1	(25)	1	(28)	0	-	1	(34)
B.	Diphthongs		0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
C.	Consonants		21								
	1. Initial	15		4	(2, 4, 5, 10)	6	(3, 7, 12, 16, 17, 38)	4	(1, 8, 20, 22)	1	(19)
	2. Final	13		6	(2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12)	1	(14)	6	(1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 16)	0	-
	3. Other	9		2	(2, 6)	4	(1, 7, 14, 21)	3	(4, 9, 10)	0	-
D.	Clusters		15								
	1. Initial	7		1	(5 + 22)	3	(10 + 1, 21, 38)	0	-	3	(3, 4 + 21; 6 + 22)
	2. Final	8		2	(8 + 5; 9 + 3)	1	(21 + 3)	1	(9 + 11)	4	(3 + 10; 6 + 11, 7 + 1; 8 + 2)
	3. Other	4		1	(9 + 3)	0	-	0	-	3	(3 + 10; 7 + 1; 8 + 2)

* See Appendix "C" for sounds which correspond to these numbers.

3. Analysis of Sound/Symbol Conflicts

Table 15: SOUND/SYMBOL CONFLICTS

	A. Same Sound, Different Spelling		B. Same Spelling, Different Sound	
	Sound*	Spelling	Spelling	Sound in Word . .
Biff and . . .	#9	drinking	-	-
	#2	sit, sitting		
	#6	dig, digging		
Kid Kit . . .	#1	tip, tipping	th	think, the
	#3	Kid, catfish		
	#7	swim, swimming	a	and, a
	#34	a, the		
Nat the Rat	#3	sack, Kid, cat	-	-
Tug Duck . . .	#34	a, duck, the	-	-

* See Appendix "C" for sounds which correspond to these numbers.

4. Analysis of Grammatical Patterns

Table 16: GRAMMATICAL PATTERNS

	Noun Phrases	Function Shift	Prep. Phr.	Sentence Patterns	Verb/Particle Combination
Biff and . . .	Proper Noun Biff	None	None	1. V (imp.) + NP + V (Imp.) 2. NP + is + V ing 3. And + "S"	None
Kid Kit . . .	Det + N where D = the, a	None	None	1. NP + is + V ing + and + V ing 2. NP + is + V ing, V ing	None
Nat the Rat	New Det = his; the king's Pronoun = it (subject) Adj. Phrase with the King's wig	is as main V. and aux.	with the King's wig with his pick	1. NP + is + NP 2. NP + is + V ing + Prep. Phr.	None

Table 16: GRAMMATICAL PATTERNS (Cont'd.)

	Noun Phrases	Function Shift	Prep. Phr.	Sentence Patterns	Verb/Particle Combination
Tug Duck . .	New Det = that N's It (object) Det + Adj (+ Adj) + N a big fat bag	None	in his mud hut; in the sun; in it; with mud	1. NP + is + Adj. 2. NP + is + Prep. Phr. 3. NP + is + V ing + NP + Prep. Phr. 4. NP + IS + V ing + Particle + NP 5. Is + NP + NP? 6. NP + is + ADj. + Prep. Phr. 7. But + "S"	pick up

5. **Are the Miami Linguistic Readers linguistically oriented?**

Only seventeen percent of the 72 words used in the first four readers are function words. (See Table 13). Of the twelve function words, four are determiners *(a, the, his, that),* two are prepositions *(with, in)* and there is one verb/particle combination *pick up,* which is separable but never used in that manner and which never has a pronoun object in the text. It does not appear until the 86th page in the series (P. 10 *Tug Duck and Buzz Bug.)* and is repeated four times.

None of the diphthongs and only three of the eleven English vowel sounds are used in the texts surveyed. Twenty-one of the twenty-four consonants are used however, fifteen in word initial position and thirteen in word final position, numbers 15 and 18 being omitted. (See Appendix "C") Fifteen different consonant clusters are used. The only inflectional "s" used is in the possessive forms *king's, tug's* and *Bug's,* with the pronunciation /Z/ constant for all. Of the nineteen clusters (with four duplicated) that appear in all positions in the first four books, four of them introduce letter-sounds for the

first time: the *n* in *and;* the *r* and the *k* in drink; and the *l* in milk. To be precise the *n* does appear before, but in - *ing* where it is not even a whole sound. All this despite Ralph F. Robinett's contention that "consonant letters in initial position are cumulated and given special attention as patterns of representation emerge," and his statement that "from the standpoint of the bilingual child a prolonged and systematic presentation of the grphemic system, particularly as it relates to most sounds and vowel letters, is highly desirable." [21] The consonantal letter/sound relationships are not well-controlled within the first four books of the series. The initial consonant letters in their cumulative effect vary: #16/ʧ/ and #19 /ʤ/ appear in only one word each, #8 /n/ and #17 /ð/ appear in only two; /t/ and /d/, which appear in the first story, in only three words. These words are repeated: The initial /n/ words a total of 22 times, the initial /t/ words, 46 times; the initial /d/ words, 22 times; but the initial /θ/ word, only five times and the /ʒ/ word, *jump* which appears on P. 23 of the fourth book only once.

Nevertheless, the use of only three vowel sounds in 72 words is a real plus for non-native learners, the vowels being consistently the more problematic group. The Miami readers attack three of the most difficult vowels for Spanish speakers (#25, 28 and 34– see Appendix "C"), none of which appear as consistent meaningful sounds (phonemes) in Spanish. This, in keeping with Lado's pronouncement to teach the problems first, [22] though the question must be raised as to the possible value of letting non-native learners learn to use first in English what they already know in Spanish. The sound/symbol correlation for the vowel sounds is extremely high, the only exception being three different spellings for the underlined sound in a, duck, and the.

Spelling can be a problem for students trying to figure out the pattern for adding -*ing* to verbs, but can be made clear visually since every unit–final consonant is doubled before adding *ing* in the four books with the exception of *X* which is pronounced /ks) and, of course, none of the final consonant units of symbol clusters (two or more con-

sonant letters) are doubled. However, most of the -*ing* forms were introduced without the introduction of the uninflected verb form. (See p. 50, 51.)

As mentioned above the low number of function words is a positive feature.

The use of *is* as an auxiliary (is + verb + ing) before its use as a main verb is disturbing only in view of the fact that the suggested order of patterns used in the *Handbook* [23] illustrates how much can be taught based on the verb *be* before introducing the auxiliary *be* in the present continuous tense. However, the use of *is,* is consistent in both; *am* and *are* do not appear in the first four books, not until p. 21 of Book 6, *On the Rock in the Pond,* and p. 6 of Book 7, *The Picnic Ship* respectively. Half of all the sentence patterns in the first four texts use *is* as an auxiliary and 36% of them use *is* as a main verb. The only sentence pattern that does not include *is* is the imperative, which is used in only the first book in order to introduce the uninflected verb forms *sit, dig,* and *drink* before using the *is* + *ing* forms.

The small number of function words, the high control of vowel sounds used, the small number of sentence patterns, and the high consistency of the use of *is* in almost all of the sentence patterns add up to a series which is decidedly linguistically oriented even if not totally controlled.

D. The Merrill Linguistic Readers

Readers 1 and 2 contain approximately one-hundred-and-sixty pages. Reader 1 will be used with the first twenty-three pages of Reader 2 for the analysis.

1. The Number of New Words

Table 17: WORD COUNT

	# of pages	# of words*				
		lexical	%	function	%	total
Reader 1	77	29	71	12	29	41
Reader 2	first 23	13	65	7	35	20
Total:	100	42	69	19	31	61

* does not include inflections of the same word, all of which are counted as one word.

2. The Sound System of Isolated Words in the Texts

Table 18: ANALYSIS OF SOUNDS

		Different Sounds-Totals	Reader 1 # of Sounds	Reader 1 The Sounds*	Reader 2 # of Sounds	Reader 2 The Sounds*
A.	Vowels	9				
	1. Initial	4	4	(25, 28, 29, 34)	0	-
	2. Final	3	3	(24, 33, 34)	0	-
	3. Other	6	3	(28, 29, 32)	3	(25, 27, 31)
B.	Diphthongs	1				
	1. Initial	1	1	(35)	0	-
	2. Final	0	0	-	0	-
	3. Other	0	0	-	0	-
C.	Consonants	16		(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12,		-
	1. Initial	15	15	13, 17, 20, 21, 22, 38)	0	-
	2. Final	8	6	(1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8)	2	(13, 22)
	3. Other	0	0	-	0	-
D.	Clusters	7				
	1. Initial	0	0	-	0	-
	2. Final	7	6	(5, 6, 8 + 11; 1, 2 + 10; 8 + 5)	1	(3 + 10)
	3. Other	0	0	-	0	-

* See Appendix "C" for sounds which correspond to these numbers.

3. Analysis of Sound/Symbol Conflicts

Table 19: SOUND/SYMBOL CONFLICTS

A. Same Sound, Different Spelling

1. Reader 1		2. Reader 2	
Sound*	Spelling	Sound*	Spelling
#3	cat, look	None	None
#34	a, the		

B. Same Spelling, Different Sound

Spelling	Sound in the Word. . .	Spelling	Sound in the Word. . .
e	the, he	f	for, of
i	is, I	o	for, of
o	on, to		
s	taps, bags		
's	Dad's, Nat's		

* See Appendix "C" for sounds which correspond to these numbers.

4. Analysis of Grammatical Patterns

a. Reader 1

1. Noun Phrases (NP)

a) Proper Noun

b) Determiner + (Adjective) + Noun: where D = a, the, N ' s

N = singular until p. 66

c) Pronouns: he, I

d) Adjective Phrase: The cat on the mat

2. Function Shift

a) Can functions as an auxiliary and as a noun.

b) At functions as a verb particle and as a preposition.

c) Bat functions as a verb and a noun.

d) Hat functions as a noun and a noun modifier.

e) Had functions as a main verb and as part of the auxiliary had to.

3. Prepositional Phrases (Prep. Phr.)

a) Without determiner: on, at, to + Proper Noun, and also at bat

b) With determiner: on, at, to + D + N (all of which are singular until p. 68)

4. Sentence Patterns ("S")

a)	NP + is + NP	Nat is a cat.
b)	NP + is + Adjective	Nat is fat.
c)	Is + NP + NP?	Is Nat a cat?
d)	Is + NP + Adjective?	Is Nat fat?
e)	V (imperative) + NP	Pat Nat.
f)	NP + V (past)* + Prep. Phr.	A cat sat on a mat.
g)	V (imp.) + NP + Prep. Phr.	Pat fat Nat on the mat.
h)	NP + is + Prep. Phr.	A cat is on a mat.

i)	IS + NP + Prep. Phr.?	Is the mat on Nat?
j)	NP + is + not + . . .	The hat is not on Nat.
k)	V (imp.) + NP, not + NP	Pat the cat, not the rat.
l)	Can + NP + V?	Can the man bat?
m)	NP + can + V + . . .	The man can pat Nat.
n)	NP + V + Infinitive of purpose + NP	Dan ran to fan the man.
o)	V (imp.) + NP + VP	Look at Nat bat the cat.
p)	Is + NP + ADJ. + Prep. Phr. ?	Is Dad mad at Nat?
q)	NP + had to + V + NP	Dad had to fan Dan.
r)	NP + V + s + . . .	He taps the bat.
s)	Compound predicate	He bats and tags the bags.
t)	"S" + and + "S"	Nat is bad and Dad is mad.
u)	Compound Subject	Rags and Nat ran.
v)	I + am + . . .	I am Rags.
w)	Am + I + . . . ?	Am I Dan?

* Limited to three verbs in the matrix patterns: sat, ran, had (See Table 20)

5. **Verb + particle combinations: look at**

b. **Reader 2**

1. New Noun Phrases

a) New Pronouns: it, she

b) New Determiners: bits of, a bit of

2. Function Shift

a) A bit is used as a noun phrase and as part of a determiner.

b) Ham functions as a noun and a noun modifier

3. New Prepositional Phrases

a) Without determiners: at, in + it; on, to, for, in, into + noun (plural); Of only in bits of ham and a bit of ham

b) With determiners: in, for, into + determiner + singular noun

4. New Sentence Patterns

a)	NP + is + NP + Prep. Phr.	It is a pin for a cap.
b)	Prep. Phr. + is + NP	On the bag is a tag.
c)	Direct Speech Patterns	
(1)	"S," + NP + said.*	"I am six," he said.
(2)	NP + said, "S."	Pam said, "I am Pam."
(3)	"S," said + NP + to + NP	"Dan is bad," said Pam to Rags.

5. Verb + particle combinations: look for

* New irregular verbs (past): took, said, lit

5. Are the Merrill readers linguistically oriented?

Of the sixty one words used in the first one-hundred pages of the Merrill readers, nineteen words (31%), are function words, see Table 17. Two are determiners, (*a, the*) and four are pronouns (*he, I, it and she*); seven are prepositions (*on, at, to, in, into, for, and of,* which appears only in the phrasal determiners *[bits of and a bit of]*) and two appear in the verb/particle combinations *look at* (p. 22, Reader 1) and *look for* (p. 10, Reader 2). The remaining function words include *and* and *not* and two forms of the verb *be, is* and *am.* However, *I, am, it, for, of, in, into* and *she* do not appear until after page 70 of Reader I. (See Table 20, p. 46, 47).

Nine of the eleven vowel sounds and one of the three diphthong sounds (the word *I*) in English appear.

Two of the vowel sounds #28 /ae/ and #25 /I/ (See Appendix C) appear in all of the words except for twelve of the function words and three of the content words. Of these two vowel sounds, #28 /ae/ appears in twenty-eight of the twenty-nine content words in Reader 1, and #25 /I/ appears in eleven of the thirteen content words introduced in Reader 2. In total, all but fifteen of the sixty-one words in the two texts under consideration contain these two vowel sounds. (See Table 20.) However *can* is pronounced

differently as an isolated word /kæn/ and as an auxiliary in the stream of speech / k ə n /.

Once again note that the authors have built their initial two matrices around #28 /ae/ and #25 /I/, two sounds that are difficult for Spanish speakers (See p. 38), though this series was not designed specifically for Spanish speakers. It was, in fact, designed for native speakers, which underlines once again, the need for a strong foundation in oral skills.

Sixteen of the twenty-four English consonants sounds appear in the text (all but #9, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 23). Of the eight consonants that appear in final position, only one #6 /g/ does not appear initially. Of the fifteen consonant sounds that appear initially, only one #17 /ð/ appears in only one word, the function word *the.* The remaining fourteen consonants appear in sets with nine matrices. (See Table 20.)

There are seven consonant clusters, all appearing in final position. Of these only *-nd (and)* and *-ks (x)* are not parts of inflections. The remainder include /s/ and /z/ pronunciation variants of *'s (Nat's, Dan's)* and *s* plural and third person singular, simple present tense (*maps, bags; pats, wags).* (See Table 20).

The frequency of occurrence for each word on Table 20 ranges from a low of nine for *am* which appears for the first time on page 71 of Reader 1 to a frequency of one-hundred-sixty-two for *the,* with the majority of words appearing between twenty and thirty times.

The matrix concept (suggested by Bloomfield and Barnhart [24], and Fries [25]) is a positive feature for students who are learning to read a language, native or otherwise, provided the language (words, patterns) are within the listening- and speaking-ability-range of the students. (The matrix concept is used to some extent by Dr. Seuss in *Hop on Pop.* Random House: New York 1963.) The sound/symbol correlation for both vowels and consonants is extremely high in the Merrill readers and should be a definite aid to the learner. Excepting the fifteen sight words ("other words" on Table 20), spelling should not prove problematic.

Whether the regularity of word patterns is a factor sufficient enough to compensate for the relatively high number of sentence patterns which appear in the texts is difficult to answer. The best answer lies with the success or lack of success found in the classrooms. Nevertheless, the grammatical sentence patterns will be discussed in a little detail.

The first ten sentence patterns include one pattern with an irregular verb (the matrix word, *sat)* and three patterns with an imperative verb (the matrix word, *pat).* The other six patterns contain *is* as a main verb. It is never used as an auxiliary in the first hundred pages. All of the words but *into* contain only one syllable and the *-ing* inflection would require at least a second syllable.

The next ten patterns contain one new imperative pattern with the sight verb/particle combination *look at,* a new pattern with *is,* two patterns with *can* as auxilliary, one with *had to* as auxiliary, and the third person singular present tense inflection *s* (on matrix words). In fact, aside from the new verb forms (with *can, had to,* and *- s)* the patterns were not in fact new. The three remaining patterns include the word *and* in compound subjects, predicates, objects and sentences.

The two remaining patterns in Reader 1 are not new patterns but old patterns with new forms *I* and *am.*

The six new patterns in Reader 2 include two with *is* as the main verb, one with inverse word order *(On the bag is a tag.)*, three patterns for direct speech and one pattern which combines two previously taught patterns.

No attempt to reduce the high number of patterns into seemingly similar groups can evade one fact however; no matter how similar the patterns seem, they *are* different.

What effect the regularity and frequency of occurrence of words in the text has on offsetting the high number of sentence patterns for non-native learners is still to be answered in the classroom. Moreover, it will be necessary to take precautions to insure that students in fact understand what they have read and are not just reading words via the matrix patterns they have learned.

The Merrill readers are linguistically oriented, but for the needs of non-native learners, the controls are limited.

Interestingly perhaps, the Merrill readers come closest to what is suggested for teaching reading in the Board of Education *Handbook for Language Arts* (Pre-K-Two): "In beginning reading children's ability to express themselves orally is very important. Their oral expression becomes the basis for their first reading charts. For second language learners, this technique can be used *when children have acquired oral control of some vocabulary and sentence patterns.* It is not necessary to wait until children express all their ideas with complete fluency. For example, the sentence pattern and vocabulary in 'This is a pan' have been presented and practiced using all the techniques . . . for developing oral control. The children can use this pattern to talk about many things. They are now ready to see the printed form. The teacher prepares a chart, using words that rhyme with pan and are spelled similarly, e.g.,"[26]

This is a pan.

This is a can.

This is a van.

Table 20: WORDS IN MERRILL READERS 1 AND 2 (to P. 23)

Reader 1

Page	Inflections	Matrix Words: Lexical	Matrix Words: Function	Other Words: Lexical	Other Words: Function
		–at			
5		cat, fat			is
		Nat			a
9		pat			the
13		mat, sat			on
17		hat			not
21		rat, bat	at	look	

Table 20: (Cont'd.)

Reader 1

Page	Inflections	Matrix Words Lexical	Matrix Words Function	Other Words Lexical	Other Words Function
		–an			
25		man, ran	can		
		Dan			
31		fan, pan			to
		van			
		–ap			
37	Dan's	cap, lap			
43		map, nap			
		tap			
		–ad			
50	Dad's	Dad, had			he
	Nat's	bad			
55		mad, sad			
		–ag			
61		bag, rag			
		tag			
66	bats, pats				and
	taps, maps				
	bags, rags				
	tags				
71	wags, Rags	wag			I
		–am			
			am		

Reader 2

		–it			
5	bits, fits	bit, fit	it		for
	hits, sits	hit, sit			
		lit			
		–in			
11	pins, wins	pin, win	in, into		of
	bins	bin, tin			
		–ix			
18		fix, mix	six	took	she
				said	

Table 21: WORDS IN BANK STREET PRE-PRIMERS

In the City

Page	Inflections	Words: Lexical	Words: Function
1		city	in, the
2			one
3		house	
4	houses		two
5			three
6			many
7	streets	street	
11		people	
13		are	
15			and
16		go	
18	stores		to
19			out
20		work	they
21			up, down
22	boys, girls		
23		school	
24		run	
27		night	
28	lights	light	on
31		good	

People Read

Page	Inflection	Words: Lexical	Words: Function
1		read	
4			all, over
10		morning	
12	comes	sun	
13		sunlight	
14		come, say	
15			Hi
16	runs	boy	he
17			who
19		day	
20	goes	man	a
21		mailman	is
22			into
24		truck	
25		workman	
26			at
27	says	father	
28	Ann's	mother	
29	works	Ann	she, her
30		good-by	
		have	
31	reads	room	
33		lunch	
		lunchroom	
34			yes, it
35			some
36			I, will
37	cars	stop	
38	books		
41		see	
42		store	
43		ice cream	
45		fire	
47		look	
48	turns	red	
	trucks		
49	stops	fireman	
51		put	
52			away
54	birds	Ben	
56		fly	
58		high	
59		sky	
60			back
63		free	

Note: Many words that appear under "Inflection" appear later under "Lexical." Some never appear under "Lexical," e.g. *girl*, *car*.

Table 22: WORDS IN FIRST FOUR MIAMI READERS

A. Biff and Tiff

		Words	
Page	Inflection	Lexical	Function
3		Biff	
4		Tiff	
7		sit	
9	sitting		is
12		dig	
14	digging		
15			and
17		drink	
18	drinking		

B. Kid Kit and the Catfish

3		Kid Kit	
5	thinking	milk	
8	tipping	dish	the
9	spilling		
11		fish	
		wish	
12	swimming		a
13	fishing		
14		catfish	
16	slipping		
17	sinking		
21	dripping		

C. Nat the Rat

3		Nat, rat	
4		King, Kim	
5	king's	Cab, cat	
6		Rab, rabbit	
7		Pap, pig	
8	napping		
11		pin	it
12	missing		
13			his
14	singing		
16		ring (n)	
21		wig	
22			with
25		pick (n)	
27		sack	that

D. Tug Duck and Buzz Bug

		Words	
Page	Inflection	Lexical	Function
3		Tug Duck	
4		big, fat	
5		hat, club	
6		Buzz Bug	
7		hut	in
8	fixing	sun	
10		mud	
11			up
12	hunting		
15	running	hand	
17	hitting		
20	grabbing		
21	kicking		
23	jumping		
24	humming		
25	cutting		
28		bump (n)	
29		black	
30			but

(n) = noun

Note: many words that appear under "Inflection" do not appear under "Lexical" in uninflected forms, *e.g. thinking, tipping.*

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

The success or failure of any reading program for non-native speakers of English is directly related to the success of the complementary ESL program the students obtain. Pupils cannot be expected to read words they cannot say or understand. This is a problem especially of, but not limited to, non-native speakers. Enough cannot be said about the need for an underlying foundation, and concurrent build-up, in oral English skills.

At the same time, this success depends upon people: the enthusiasm the teachers bring to the respective programs. A program cannot be successful with teachers who are unwilling to use the materials and the techniques suggested for their maximum effectiveness. Both the Merrill and the Miami programs appear to be staffed by a group of enthusiastic teachers, thanks in large part to the administrators who selected most of them on a volunteer basis. Any teacher who is unhappy using either set of materials should not be forced, or, in fact, even permitted, to continue in that program. A willing neophyte, trained and guided to do the job, will be better in the long run than a teacher who has used the materials for one or two semesters but does not like them.

Both the Merrill and the Miami reading programs offer something of the "systematic progression that builds each new segment on one already learned" and, as such, apparently offer more than the more traditional types of reading programs which depend on sight reading by the students, and which, among other factors, require almost absolute oral competence as a starting point. Since no phonics approach was analyzed in this evaluation, the comments made do not apply to that approach.

The Merrill program depends on the spelling matrices to help students learn to read, and the students were reading with little or no difficulty, apparently having overcome the burden of the large number of grammatical patterns found in the texts. Since the matrix approach leads to the danger of pupils learning to read a word they do not

know, special care must be taken to be certain that the students do understand, and moreover, can use, all that they are being asked to read.

The Miami program depends on the relatively strict control of grammatical patterns, good control of the vowel sounds employed, and, though not supported by the analysis of the first four books, a similar-to-Merrill attempt at developing spelling matrices, according to Ralph F. Robinett (See P. 38.) There is, however, great dependence on sight recognition of many of the consonants in the first four books. On the other hand, the Miami program has the definite asset of the built-in oral program revolving around the "Big Books."

B. Recommendations

Since both programs will be continuing into the third year, the following recommendations are made in the interest of offering something to enhance the programs.

A. Additional personnel is needed.

1. A separate coordinator should be established for each project with the responsibility of setting up on-going programs which include in-service courses (a minimum of four to six sessions); demonstration lessons on both a scheduled and an as-needed basis; and day-to-day classroom guidance, which would require

2. the use of supporting personnel (two or three for each project) to do the demonstration teaching, and provide for the day-to-day supervision.

B. Provision should be made for self-evaluation which would provide opportunities for the teachers in the respective programs to exchange ideas and techniques for dealing with the problems that they have been confronted with. Supervisors and coordinators could be invited periodically to attend these sessions.

C. The English-as-a-Second-Language Component

1. The amount of time devoted to ESL outside of each reading program varied from no time ("none available") to twenty to thirty minutes daily to "as much time as possible."

2. The ESL component should be evaluated along with the reading programs during the third year of this study to determine whether there is a solid oral skills foundation on which to build a reading program.

3. Newly licensed TESLs should be used, when available, to fill any vacancies that occur in these programs, and in critical areas in general.

D. The Third Year Evaluation should

1. extend the 'inguistic analysis of the respective materials to include the complete sets in each series, and a phonics approach as well,

2. contrast third-year scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test with the original scores at the end of the first year to determine the within group difference as well as to contrast the scores with the control groups,

3. include new first year classes in each project to obtain an eventual total of nine years in the study (assuming that three years are required for completion) with then-more-experienced teachers,

4. include the administration of a test such as the preliminary edition of the Merrill Linguistic Reading Test to act as a pre- and post- test for the first year students,

5. include visitation of all of the classes involved in each project to provide a better reading of the "pulse" of the programs.

E. Post-Evaluation Recommendations

1. The Merrill and Miami programs could apparently support each other. The evaluators recommend that another experiment be initiated on a small scale using both programs concurrently as needed, after a tentative course of study with the two series has been set up. Such an experiment might be staffed with an experienced teacher from each of the two existing programs.

2. Since the true value of a reading program affects the academic life of the students, provision should be made for follow-up studies to trace the academic success of students in the respective programs, say at the fourth, seventh, and tenth grades. Mobility is, of course, a real problem. In the computer age, however, if each pupil were given a kind of identification number (as was recently suggested), it would be feasible to make such a study.

VI. FOOTNOTES

1. "Teaching English as a Second Language in the Public Schools." Title I ESEA Project Summary Form, p. 2.

2. Ibid, p. 3

3. Bolger, Philip A., Howard Tiilis and Luis Rivera. *Improving the Teaching of English as a Second Language (Grades K - 6): An Evaluation.* Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York, March 1969, pp. 16-18; 33-35.

4. Memo to each District Superintendent, dated March 12, 1969.

5. Title I ESEA Project Summary Form, title page.

6. Ibid, p. 2.

7. "Information Sheet on Project or Experiment – Pilot Project in the Use of Commercial Materials: Merrill Linguistic Readers," January 1968, p. 1.

8. "Information Sheet on Project or Experiment – Pilot Project in the Use of Commercial Materials: Miami Linguistic Readers," January 1968, p. 1.

9. Sutaria, Minda C., and J. Donald Bowen (Ed.). *Basic Readers for English Teaching.* Phoenix Publishing House: Quezon City, the Philippines, n.d., p. 2.

10. Lado, Robert. *Language Testing.* Longmans: London, 1961, p. 241.

11. Sutaria and Bowen, p. 10.

12. Ibid, p. 14.

13. Ibid, P. vii.

14. *Handbook for Language Arts (Pre-K to Two).* Board of Education of the City of New York: Curriculum Bulletin, 1965-66 #8, p. 370. (From the Puerto Rican Study Report, p. 169.)

15. Bolger et al, pp. 6, 22 (Table 1, each page).

16. *Handbook for Language Arts,* p. 309.

17. Ibid, P. 311.

18. Ibid, p. 309.

19. Bell, Paul W. "The Education of the Spanish-Speaking Child in Florida." *On Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Series III. Betty W. Robinett (Ed.). Washington, D. C., 1967, 36-37.

20. *Handbook for Language Arts,* p. 310.

21. Robinett, Ralph F. 'Constructing a Developmental Reading Program for Children Who Speak Other Languages: Some Basic Criteria." *On Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Series II. Carol J. Kreidler (Ed.). Washington, D.C., 1966, 48.

22. Lado, Robert. *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach.* McGraw Hill: New York, 1964, p. 52.

23. *Handbook for Language Arts,* pp. 333–359.

24. Bloomfield, Leonard, and Clarence L. Barnhart. *Let's Read.* Wayne State University Press: Detroit, 1961. (Barnhart quotes a letter from Bloomfield describing the approach, dated Nov. 7, 1937), p. 9.

25. Fries, Charles C. *Linguistics and Reading.* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.: New York, 1962, 1963.

26. *Handbook for Language Arts,* pp. 324-325. See also Reader 1, Merrill Linguistic Readers, p. 31.

APPENDIX "A"

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Prepared for Title III Evaluation: ESL Programs -
Board of Education of the City of New York

Prof. Nadler
Prof. Willis
Prof. Marelli
Prof. Martiniz of
New York University

Please answer each question as completely as possible.

1. How long have you been teaching?

2. Please list degrees held and specializations under each.

3. How much previous experience have you had at this grade level?

4. What other reading materials have you used? Please list.

5. What other ESL materials have you used? Please list.

6. Have you taught ESL students before? How long? Where?

7. Have you had any ESL training other than indicated above? Please describe.

8. Have you had any training in linguistics? Please list courses.

9. How were you trained for this program?

10. What additional training would you like to have, if any?
    a. additional lectures _____
    b. periodic formal seminars _____
    c. structured informal seminars _____
    d. discussion groups _____
    e. Please list any other _____

11. How does this program compare with other materials you have listed in #4 above? Why?

12. What are major advantages of this program, if any?

13. What are major disadvantages of this program, if any?

14. Is there anything you would like to see incorporated into these materials? Please list:

15. If the choice were yours, would you want to teach with these same materials again? Why (not)?

16. Would you recommend these materials to your colleagues? Why (not)?

17. What languages have you studied? How proficient (poor, fair, good, excellent) are you as to aural comprehension, speaking ability, ability to read and write?

18. What is the student makeup of your class?

male _____ female _____

native English speaking _____

non-native English _____

a. Spanish _____
b. Chinese _____
c. _____
d. _____
e. _____

19. What is the approximate absentee rate for this group?

20. Are you aware of any polarization among students? If so, to what extent does it occur?

APPENDIX "B"

TEACHER OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

Prof. Nadler
Prof. Willis
Prof. Marelli
Prof. Martiniz of
New York University

Prepared for Title III Evaluation: ESL Programs –
Board of Education of the City of New York

Rating System: N/A = not applicable; 0 = unacceptable; 1 = poor; 2 = acceptable; 3 = good; 4 = excellent

	N/A	0	1	2	3	4	Comments
1. Attitude/Manner							
2. Knowledge and Use of student names							
3. Ask question, then call on student							
4. Awareness of Student Needs							
5. Speech Pattern: colloquial; normal classroom speed.							
6. How much did the teacher talk? Ratio of teacher/student talk?							
7. Was focus of lesson clear?							
8. How well was new material introduced?							
9. How well was material practiced after introduction?							
10. How much practice with new material?							
11. How well was drill extended into communication?							
12. Was the model appropriate for correct responses?							
13. Instructions and Cueing: Did students know what teacher expected?							
14. Variety of activities/change of pace							
15. Distribution of student participation among group. Are all students participating?							
16. How well was "previously learned" material practiced, reviewed and reinforced?							
17. How well were corrections made?							

	N/A	0	1	2	3	4	Comments
18. How well were students' questions answered by the teacher?							
19. How well were explanations made?							
20. How well was at-home follow-up accomplished?							
21. How well were audio-visual aids employed?							
22. Did teacher recognize difference between teaching and testing?							
23. Did lesson have a beginning, a middle, and an end?							
24. How well did teacher proceed from known to unknown?							
25. How well did teacher proceed from receptive to productive?							
26. How well did teacher proceed from simple to complex?							
27. How well did teacher proceed from concrete to abstract?							
28. How well did teacher proceed from manipulation to communication?							
29. How effective was practice in listening?							
30. How effective was practice in speaking?							
31. How effective was practice in reading?							
32. How effective was practice in writing?							
33. How effective was choral practice?							
34. How effective was individual practice?							
35. If teacher used student's native language, how effectively was it done?							

	N/A	0	1	2	3	4	Comments
How effectively were these techniques used? 36. repetition after the teacher model?							
37. response to language cues?							
38. initiation of communication situations by students?							
39. How did teacher evaluate student comprehension and progress?							

STUDENT OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

1. What was the classroom atmosphere and the rapport among students?							
2. What was level of student interest?							
3. What was student attitude toward materials?							
How effective was individual student participation in: 4. repetition?							
5. response?							
6. initiation?							
7. Did students seem to understand the teacher?							
8. Did students seem to understand the material?							
9. Did students use English outside of lesson framework?							
10. Did students correct each other?							

APPENDIX "C"

PHONETIC SYMBOLS

Consonants			Vowels		
#	/sound/	key word	#	/sound/	key word
1	p	pay	24	i	beat
2	t	top			
3	k	kit, cat	25	I	bit
4	b	bet			
5	d	debt	26	e	bait
6	g	get			
7	m	met	27	ɛ	bet
8	n	net			
9	ŋ	ring	28	æ	bat
10	s	set			
11	z	quiz	29	a	hot
12	f	fit			
13	v	vet	30	o	boat
14	š	shop			
15	ž	beige	31	ɔ	bought
16	θ	three			
17	ð	the	32	ʊ	book
18	č	cheap			
19	ǰ	judge	33	u	boot
20	h	hot			
21	l	lot	34	ə*	but, away
22	r	rot			
23	y	yet	* stressed and unstressed		
38	w	wet			

Diphthongs**

35	ay	I
36	ɔy	boy
37	aw	cow

** the "r" colored vowels (or diphthongs) have been excluded from this evaluation as such; they are treated as vowel + /r/.

APPENDIX "D"

Harvey Nadler, Ph. D., Director of Project
Associate Professor of English Education
Director, Programs in Teaching English to Speakers
of Other Languages
New York University

Robert M. Willis, Ed. D.
Associate Professor of English Education
New York University

Leonard R. Marelli, A.M.
Assistant Director, The American Language Institute
New York University

Antonio Martinez, A.M.
Assistant Professor of English Education
The University of Puerto Rico